UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,782	11/10/2003	Andrew Dellow	851963.414	4386
38106 7590 05/04/2010 SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400			EXAMINER	
			DEBNATH, SUMAN	
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2435	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/04/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/705,782	DELLOW ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
SUMAN DEBNATH	2435	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)  13. Other:
/Kimyen Vu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in page two of the remark that: "[t]he key register (130) of Ducharme is not a common key store for a decrypted common key."

In response to applicant's argument Examiner asserts that Ducharme discloses the common key is stored in decrypted form in an integrated circuit (col. 2, lines 18-50, col. 3, lines 5-61, see also, col. 4, lines 35-47, col. 5, lines 19-35, col. 7, lines 58-67 and col. 8, lines 20-65; it should be noted that Ducharme discloses a encryption key register 130 (FIG. 1) which teaches the concept of having a common key store in an integrated circuit and/or in a monolithic device); Furthermore, it should be noted that key register resides within a device; thus it's not a smart card. Ducharme stores an encryption key but no where in Ducharme's art was mentioned that encryption key was stored in encrypted form which Applicant is arguing. Ducharme's key register 130 stores encryption key in a decryption form (col. 2, lines 18-50, col. 3, lines 5-61).

Applicant argues that: "Thee element clearly missing from the combination of Ducharme and Mills is the decrypted common key store that stores a plurality of decrypted common keys"

In response to applicant's argument it should be noted that Ducharme teaches a key register which stores encryption key (col. 2, lines 18-50, col. 3, lines 5-61) which is within a system and not a smart card. Ducharme never mentioned that encryption key had to be in an encrypted form before storing to the key register, thus keys in clear form (i.e. decrypted form) are stored in key register. Further to clarify, anybody with ordinary skill in the art would understand that a key register holds plurality of keys.

Applicant argues that: "Ducharme utilizes a staged decryption of an encrypted control word that is then used to decrypt encrypted data which is only half of what applicants are describing and claiming in the present application"

In response to applicant's argument Examiner asserts that Ducharme's reference was used as a secondary reference to show that encryption key can be stored in clear form within the circuit itself. Miller is a primary reference which was cited for other limitations.